

REMARKS

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claim 1 – 3. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining pending claims. In that regard, claim 8 and 16 has been amended analogously to the limitation of claim 1. For example, claim 8 now recites “wherein a farthest virtual source point of said optical path after said beamshaper is positioned in the optical path is substantially the same as said farthest virtual source point before said beamshaper is positioned in the optical path.” In this fashion, the informality noted in the 5/05/05 office action has been addressed.

Applicants agree that the Shimano reference (USP 5,930,220) does not suggest or teach such a claimed beamshaper. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion that the Ngoi reference (USP 6,195,208) discloses a beamshaper that satisfies the limitation of “wherein a farthest virtual source point of said optical path after said beamshaper is positioned in the optical path is substantially the same as said farthest virtual source point before said beamshaper is positioned in the optical path.” For example, as suggested by the title, Ngoi is plainly directed to a lens. By definition, a lens must change the source point of light passing through it or there is no focusing. This focusing is illustrated in Figure 2: to an observer looking into the lens from the right side, the virtual source point would be infinity as the light rays 8,8' are parallel to a light ray on axis 3. However as seen on the left side of the lens, these parallel rays are focused onto points 1a and 2a (the different focal points being provided to cure astigmatism). Thus, the Ngoi reference teaches away from a beamshaper that does not change the farthest virtual source point. Accordingly, claim 8 and its dependent claims 11 and 12 are patentable over the cited prior art analogously as with regard to allowed claim 1. Similarly, claim 16 and its dependent claims 19 and 20 are also patentable over the cited prior art analogously as discussed with regard to allowed claim 1.

LAW OFFICES OF
MACPHERSON, KWOK CHEN
& HEID LLP


1762 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 224
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(415) 752-7040
FAX (408) 392-9262

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, pending Claims 1-3, 8, 11-12, 16, 19 and 20 are in condition for allowance and allowance of the application is hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (949) 752-7040 is welcomed and encouraged.

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is facsimile transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, at 571-273-8300, on August 4, 2005.


Saundra Carr August 4, 2005
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan W. Hallman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,644

LAW OFFICES OF
MACPHERSON, KWOK CHEN
& HEID LLP

1242 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 216
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(949) 752-7040
FAX (408) 292-0262